1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MELINDA HAAG (CABN 132612) United States Attorney  J. DOUGLAS WILSON (DCBN 412811) Deputy Chief, Criminal Division  GARTH HIRE (CABN 187330) Assistant United States Attorney  1301 Clay Street, Suite 340-S Oakland, California 94612-5217 Telephone: (510) 637-3929 Facsimile: (510) 637-3724 E-Mail: Garth.Hire@usdoj.gov  Attorneys for Plaintiff		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
12	OAKLAND DIVISION		
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) No. CR 09-00775 SBA		
14 15	Plaintiff, ) STIPULATION AND ORDER CONTINUING STATUS CONFERENCE		
16	v. ) AND EXCLUDING TIME )		
17 18	JUAN OCTAVIANO LOPEZ, aka Juan Octavio Lopez Ortiz, aka Juan Lopez Gomez, aka Manuel Vargas, and GLENDY GOMEZ, )		
19	aka Glendy Elizabeth Gomez, )		
20	Defendants. )		
21			
22	Plaintiff, by and through its attorney of record, and defendants, by and through their		
23	counsel of record, hereby stipulate and ask the Court to find as follows:		
24	1. A status conference in this matter is currently scheduled for 10 a.m. on Tuesday,		
25	July 26, 2011.		
26	2. The parties request that this hearing be continued until 10 a.m. on Tuesday,		
27	September 13, 2011, in order to provide defendants' counsel with additional time to evaluate the		
28	evidence in this case and determine whether or not defendant should enter a change of plea or		
	STIPULATION AND ORDER RESCHEDULING HEARING; EXCLUDING TIME		

file motions and to prepare for trial in this matter.

- 3. Specifically, the parties submitted the methamphetamine in this case for independent examination and analysis by an non-government laboratory. The results of this independent analysis was significantly different than the results of the analysis by the government's chemist. Therefore, the parties require additional time to investigate and evaluate the possible reasons for the disparity between the results which likely will require each chemist to further analyze and review the analysis conducted by the other chemist. In addition, counsel for defendant Gomez has been in trial and is presently unavailable to attend the presently scheduled status conference. The parties believe that failure to grant the above-requested continuance would deny defendants' counsel and defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation taking into account the exercise of due diligence and that the ends of justice served by continuing the case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and defendant in a trial within the date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act.
- 4. Thus, the parties respectfully request that the Court find that the time period from July 26, 2011, to September 13, 2011, is excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A), (B)(iv) because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at the defendants' request and on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial and because failure to grant the continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel the time necessary for effective preparation for trial, taking into account due diligence, as well as continuity of counsel.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

II IS SO SIII OLATED.	
	MELINDA HAAG United States Attorney
Dated: July 22, 2011	/s/ GARTH HIRE Assistant United States Attorney
	Attorney for United States of America
	Autorney for officed states of America
Dated: July 22, 2011	/s/
-	

1	LYNN KESLAR		
2	Attorney for Defendant Juan Octaviano Lopez		
3	Juan Octaviano Lopez		
4			
5	Dated: July 22, 2011  /s/ RANDALL KNOX		
6	Attorney for Defendant		
7	Glendy Gomez		
8			
9			
10	ORDER		
11	FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN, IT IS SO FOUND AND ORDERED THAT:		
12	1. The currently scheduled July 26, 2011, status conference hearing is vacated. A		
13	status conference hearing is now scheduled for 10:00 a.m. on September 13, 2011.		
14	2. The time period from July 26, 2011, to September 13, 2011, is deemed excludable		
15	pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A), (B)(iv) because it results from a continuance granted by		
16	the Court at the defendants' request and on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of		
17	justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendants in		
18	a speedy trial and because failure to grant the continuance would unreasonably deny defense		
19	counsel the time necessary for effective preparation for trial, taking into account due diligence,		
20	as well as continuity of counsel.		
21	DATED: 7/25/11 Saundre B Ormstrong		
22	DATED: 7/25/11 FILLIAL D Granding HONORABLE SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG		
23	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			